



*Report to the Legislature on School Redesign:
Expanding Learning Time to Support Student
Success*

Line-item 7061-9412
January 2008



This document was prepared by the
Massachusetts Department of Education
Jeffrey Nellhaus
Acting Commissioner of Education

Board of Education Members

Mr. Paul Reville, Chairman, Worcester
Ms. Ann Reale, Vice-Chair, Commissioner, Early Education and Care, Boston
Mr. Christopher Anderson, Westford
Ms. Harneen Chernow, Jamaica Plain
Dr. Thomas E. Fortmann, Lexington
Ms. Ruth Kaplan, Brookline
Dr. Patricia Plummer, Chancellor, Higher Education, Boston
Dr. Sandra L. Stotsky, Brookline
Mr. Zachary Tsetsos, Chair, Student Advisory Council, Oxford
Jeffrey Nellhaus, Acting Commissioner
and Secretary to the Board

The Massachusetts Department of Education, an affirmative action employer, is committed to ensuring that all of its programs and facilities are accessible to all members of the public. We do not discriminate on the basis of age, color, disability, national origin, race, religion, sex or sexual orientation. Inquiries regarding the Department's compliance with Title IX and other civil rights laws may be directed to the Human Resources Director, 350 Main St., Malden, MA 02148 781-338-6105.

© 2008 Massachusetts Department of Education
Permission is hereby granted to copy any or all parts of this document for non-commercial educational purposes. Please credit the "Massachusetts Department of Education."

This document printed on recycled paper

Massachusetts Department of Education
350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5023
Phone 781-338-3000 TTY: N.E.T. Relay 800-439-2370
www.doe.mass.edu





Jeffrey Nellhaus
Acting Commissioner of Education

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Education

350 Main Street, Malden, Massachusetts 02148-5023

Telephone: (781) 338-3000
TTY: N.E.T. Relay 1-800-439-2370

February 2008

Dear Members of the General Court:

I am pleased to present the *Report to the Legislature on School Redesign: Expanding Learning Time to Support Student Success* pursuant to Chapter 61 of the Acts of 2007, Section 2, line item 7061-9412, addressing the following:

“provided further, that the department shall issue an annual report, not later than February 1, 2008 on the implementation of plans in all participating districts; provided further, that said report shall include, but not be limited to: the names of schools and school districts participating; the number of students attending these schools and the nature and type of changes made in participating schools as a result of this program; provided further, that the report shall also include an anticipated budget for this program for the next fiscal year and a breakdown of the distribution of the \$1,300 per student by school;”

The School Redesign: Expanded Learning Time (ELT) initiative began in FY 06 when planning grants were first included in the state budget. ELT planning grants are intended to support districts’ activities in planning for longer school days, a longer school year, or both, as part of a redesign strategy to raise student achievement. The School Redesign: Expanded Learning Time initiative requires the addition of at least 25% more time to school schedules in order to:

- Provide students with more core instructional opportunity in math, literacy, science and other core subjects to support student achievement;
- Integrate enrichment and applied learning opportunities into the school day to motivate and engage students; and
- Provide educators with increased opportunity to plan together and to participate in professional development with other teachers and in collaboration with their partnering community-based organizations.

The FY 08 state budget included a \$13 million appropriation for ELT. Currently 18 schools in eight districts are operating redesigned schools with expanded learning time. Four of the five districts that participated in the first year of the initiative expanded the number of redesigned schools in the district in year two. Three districts are new to the ELT initiative this year.

The Department has contracted with Abt Associates of Cambridge to conduct an evaluation of ELT in a three-year study that is being conducted as two interrelated parts—a planning and implementation component that explores the early decision-making phases and subsequent execution of ELT programs in the funded districts and schools, and an outcomes component that examines the outcomes of ELT for districts, schools, teachers, and students. Ultimately, the implementation and outcomes components will be linked to determine if the approaches to implementation are related to the outcomes achieved.

The Abt analysis of the implementation and early outcomes data rendered notable findings, some of which are noted below. See *Year One Report* included in this report for the full text.

- *“By the end of the first year of ELT implementation, schools had made the most progress in adding instructional time in core academics, which is among the initiative’s paramount objectives aimed at improving student achievement....*
- *Schools also made strides in fostering better connections and more meaningful relationships between students and staff—particularly through the introduction or expansion of enrichment activities.*
- *the 10 ELT schools developed and adopted schedules that essentially fit into one of three categories: an integrated schedule in which the traditional school day was reconfigured to include lengthened academic blocks, a divided schedule in which the traditional school day remained intact but was augmented with a distinct expanded day program, and a mixed schedule that included elements of both the integrated and divided schedules.*
- *The distinction of schools by schedule type nearly mirrors schools’ grade spans: the three elementary schools adopted integrated schedules while the four middle schools adopted divided schedules; two of the three K-8 schools adopted mixed schedules....*
- *All 10 Cohort 1 schools reported that the level of funding limits their programs, especially with regard to staffing.....*
- *Near the end of the first year of ELT, almost two-thirds of teacher survey respondents reported that they perceived positive effects of the expanded schedule on several dimensions of classroom instruction. In addition, more than half of teacher survey respondents indicated that student academic performance and engagement in school were improved as a result of ELT.*
- *Students’ feelings about the expanded day varied significantly by grade level, with younger students reporting positive feelings about ELT with more frequency than older students. Specifically, nearly two-thirds of students in elementary grades were happy or very happy about a longer school day as compared to 35 percent or less of students in middle school grades....”*

The Department is encouraged by these early findings and looks forward to the second and third year reports. If you have questions please feel free to contact Julianne Dow, Associate Commissioner or Sarah McLaughlin, Manager, School Redesign and Program Innovation at the Department of Education.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Nellhaus
Acting Commissioner

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
1. Introduction.....	2
2. Overview.....	2
3. Expanded Learning Time in 2008.....	4
4. Budget Request for FY 09.....	7
5. Chapter 61 of the Acts of 2007, line-item 7061-9412.....	9
6. Year One Report.....	11

1. Introduction

Pursuant to Chapter 61 of the Acts of 2007, Section 2, line item 7061-9412, the Department of Education respectfully submits this report, on *School Redesign: Expanding Learning Time to Support Student Success* addressing the following:

“provided further, that the department shall issue an annual report, not later than February 1, 2008 on the implementation of plans in all participating districts; provided further, that said report shall include, but not be limited to: the names of schools and school districts participating; the number of students attending these schools and the nature and type of changes made in participating schools as a result of this program; provided further, that the report shall also include an anticipated budget for this program for the next fiscal year and a breakdown of the distribution of the \$1,300 per student by school;”

2. Overview

The School Redesign: Expanded Learning Time (ELT) initiative began in FY 06 when planning grants were first included in the state budget. ELT planning grants are intended to support districts’ activities in planning for longer school days, a longer school year, or both, as part of a redesign strategy to raise student achievement. The grants, awarded by the Board of Education, provide resources for districts to plan innovative redesigns in selected schools that offer all students more time for challenging, research-based, and varied learning experiences. At the end of the planning grant period, districts submit ELT Implementation plans to the Department of Education. Based on review and approval of the plans, the Department awards grants to districts so that the qualifying schools can implement their plans to expand learning time for students and teachers.

The School Redesign: Expanded Learning Time initiative requires the addition of at least 25% more time to school schedules in order to:

- Provide students with more core instructional opportunity in math, literacy, science and other core subjects to support student achievement;
- Integrate enrichment and applied learning opportunities into the school day to motivate and engage students; and
- Provide educators with increased opportunity to plan together and to participate in professional development with other teachers and in collaboration with their partnering community-based organizations.

Implementation of ELT redesigns began in FY 07 when the Department of Education awarded grants of \$1300 per student. The Legislature appropriated \$6.5 million for the ELT initiative, enabling ten schools in five districts to open in September 2006 with a substantially longer school day. This appropriation also enabled the Department to fund an additional 29 districts to join in a second round of planning to explore whether and how they would redesign and expand schedules for schools in their communities.

The FY 08 state budget included a \$13 million appropriation for ELT. Currently 18 schools in eight districts are operating redesigned schools with expanded learning time. Four of the five districts that participated in the first year of the initiative expanded the number of redesigned schools in the district in year two. Three districts are new to the ELT initiative this year. The chart below includes all schools currently receiving ELT implementation funding and distinguishes whether or not the school began its redesign in 2006 or 2007.

FY08 Expanded Learning Time Schools					
District	Cohort	School	Grade Span	Projected Enrollment	Actual Enrollment
Boston	2006	Clarence R. Edwards	6-8	343	297
	2006	Mario Umana Academy	6-8	609	600
	2006	James P. Timilty	6-8	667	656
	2007	Boston Arts Academy	9-12	415	438
Cambridge	2006	Fletcher Maynard Academy	K-8	230	232
	2006	Martin Luther King, Jr.	K-8	240	251
Chicopee	2007	Bowe	PreK-5	434	431
Fall River	2006	Matthew J. Kuss	6-8	560	530
	2006	Osborn Street	K-5	385	323
	2007	North End	K-5	600	588
Fitchburg	2007	Academy Pilot	5-8	450	368
Greenfield	2007	Newton	K-4	225	196
	2007	Greenfield Middle	5-8	544	499
Malden	2006	Salemwood	K-8	1195	1126
	2007	Ferryway	K-8	850	900
Worcester	2006	Jacob Hiatt Magnet	K-6	500	469
	2007	City View	K-6	575	563
	2007	Chandler Elementary	K-6	325	312
Total Districts			8		
Total Schools			18		

3. Expanded Learning Time in September 2008

FY 07 Planning for September 2008 start

Districts that received an ELT planning grant in FY 07 had the opportunity to consider a September 2007 or September 2008 start-up. Districts that targeted a 2008 start-up submitted Preliminary Implementation Plans to the Department of Education in August 2007, received feedback from DOE staff, and submitted Final Implementation Plans in December 2007.

Submitted Final Implementation Plans – December 2007 Proposed September 2008 Start-Up				
District	School	Grades Served	Projected Enrollment	Actual Enrollment
Barnstable	Hyannis East Elementary	K-4	260	279
Brockton	Gilmore Academy	6-8	430	375
Chelsea	Chelsea High	9-12	1,450	1501
Chelsea	Clark Avenue Middle	5-8	562	585
Chelsea	Eugene Wright Middle	5-8	450	485
Chelsea	Joseph A. Browne Middle	5-8	503	416
Framingham	Cameron Middle	6-8	525	496
Framingham	Brophy Elementary	K-5	465	442
Gardner	Gardner Middle	6-8	626	706
Haverhill	Consentino Middle	6-8	588	598
Malden	Beebe	K-8	936	945
Pittsfield	Morningside Community	PK-5	400	429
Pittsfield	Silvio Conte Community	PK-5	470	442
Revere	Garfield Middle	6-8	500	526
Revere	A.C. Whelan Elementary	PK-5	770	701
Southbridge	Wells Middle	6-8	530	573
Southbridge	West Street	4-5	390	460
Taunton	John F. Parker Middle	5-8	500	457
Webster	Bartlett Junior/Senior High	7-8	320	923
Webster	Webster Middle	3-6	565	566
Westfield	Abner Gibbs Elementary	K-5	190	172
Westfield	Franklin Avenue Elementary	K-5	175	190
Westfield	Moseley Elementary	K-5	190	179
Total Districts				13
Total Schools				23

FY 08 Planning Grants

The FY 08 authorizing budget language included an allocation for Expanded Learning Time Planning Grants of up to \$250,000. In October 2007, the Board of Education approved new ELT Planning Grants to 28 districts.

FY 08 Planning Grant Recipients	
District	Amount Awarded
Amherst-Pelham	\$7,000
Andover	\$11,000
Athol-Royalston	\$7,000
Barnstable	\$7,000
Beverly	\$7,000
Central Berkshire Regional	\$7,000
Chelsea	\$11,000
Fall River	\$11,000
Fitchburg	\$7,000
Framingham	\$11,000
Greenfield	\$9,000
Haverhill	\$7,000
Leominster	\$7,000
Lynn	\$9,000
Mashpee	\$9,000
Middleborough	\$7,000
Northampton	\$7,000
North Middlesex Regional	\$7,000
Norwood	\$7,000
Revere	\$7,000
Sandwich	\$7,000
Somerville	\$11,000
Springfield	\$7,000
Taunton	\$9,000
Waltham	\$11,000
Wareham	\$7,000
Winthrop	\$7,000
Worcester	\$9,000
Total Districts	28
Total Schools	67
Total Awarded	\$230,000

As with the FY 07 Planning Grants, the FY 08 Planning Grant recipients also had the option of planning for a September 2008 start-up (fast track planning period) or a September 2009 start-up (longer track planning period). At the time of the submission of this report, the following schools and districts have indicated interest in a September 2008 start-up.

Submitted Preliminary Implementation Plans – January 2008 Proposed September 2008 Start-Up				
District	School	Grades Served	Projected Enrollment	Actual Enrollment
Fall River	Edmond P. Talbot	6-8	600	598
Fall River	Healy/New Slade Elem.	PK-5	600	234
Fall River	Laurel Lake	K-5	219	220
Fall River	Spencer Borden	K-5	475	451
Fall River	James Tansey	K-5	304	301
Fitchburg	BF Brown Arts Vision	5-8	483	486
Greenfield	Federal Street	K-4	260	252
North Adams	Brayton Elem.	K-5	287	364
North Adams	Silvio Conte Middle	6-8	316	323
North Adams	Greylock Elem.	K-5	229	229
North Adams	Sullivan Elem.	K-5	226	224
Palmer	Converse Middle	5-7	475	469
Revere	William McKinley	K-5	435	436
Worcester	Claremont Academy	7-12	445	364
Worcester	Worcester East Middle	7-8	615	571
Worcester	Woodland Academy	PK-6	445	417
Total Districts				7
Total Schools				16

4. Budget Request for FY 09

Based on projected student enrollment, the following chart demonstrates the distribution of the \$1300 per student by school and district.

FY 08 Expanded Learning Time Schools				
District	School	Projected Enrollment	Grant Amount	District Totals
Boston	Clarence R. Edwards	343	\$445,900	\$2,644,200
	Mario Umana Academy	609	\$791,700	
	James P. Timilty	667	\$867,100	
	Boston Arts Academy	415	\$539,500	
Cambridge	Fletcher Maynard Academy	230	\$299,000	\$611,000
	Martin Luther King, Jr.	240	\$312,000	
Chicopee	Bowe	434	\$564,200	\$564,200
Fall River	Matthew J. Kuss	560	\$728,000	\$2,008,500
	Osborn Street	385	\$500,500	
	North End	600	\$780,000	
Fitchburg	Academy Pilot	450	\$585,000	\$585,000
Greenfield	Newton	225	\$292,500	\$999,700
	Greenfield Middle	544	\$707,200	
Malden	Salemwood	1195	\$1,553,500	\$2,658,500
	Ferryway	850	\$1,105,000	
Worcester	Jacob Hiatt Magnet	500	\$650,000	\$1,820,000
	City View	575	\$747,500	
	Chandler Elementary	325	\$422,500	
Implementation Grant Total				\$11,891,100

If all schools that are currently pursuing ELT implementation move forward, there would be up to an additional 18,209 students enrolled in ELT schools. However, based on current projections, we anticipate an additional 10,250 students enrolled at new ELT schools in September 2008. The following chart details the anticipated costs for the Expanded Learning Time initiative for FY 09.

Requested Budget for FY 09	
Allocation	Amount
Implementation Grants to Current ELT Schools (Funding 18 current ELT Schools = 9,147 students * \$1300	\$11,891,100
New ELT Schools (10,256 additional students)	\$13,333,900
New Planning Grants	\$250,000
Continuation Planning Grants for Current Planners	\$25,000
Evaluation	\$75,000
DOE Administration	\$75,000
Extraordinary Circumstances	\$250,000
Early Implementation Grants	\$100,000
Total Requested	\$26,000,000

5. Chapter 61 of the Acts of 2007, line-item 7061-9412

7061-9412.. For grants to cities, towns, and regional school districts for the purpose of planning for and implementing expanded learning time in the form of longer school days or school years at selected schools; provided, that implementation grants shall only be provided under this item to schools and districts which submitted qualifying applications which were approved by the department in fiscal year 2007; provided further, that in approving expanded learning time implementation grant applications, preference shall be given to districts with high poverty rates or a high percentage of students scoring in levels I or II on the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System, those districts with plans that have the greatest potential for district-wide impact, those districts that plan to utilize partnerships with community-based organizations and institutions of higher education, and those districts with plans that include a comprehensive restructuring of the entire school day and/or year to maximize the use of the additional learning time; provided further, that the department shall approve implementation plans that include an appropriate mix of additional time spent on core academics, additional time spent on enrichment opportunities such as small group tutoring, homework help, music, arts, sports, physical activity, and project-based experiential learning, and additional time for teacher preparation and/or professional development; provided further, that the department shall only approve implementation plans that assume not more than \$1,300 per pupil per year in future state appropriations of expanded learning time implementation funds; provided further, that in extraordinary cases the department may exceed the \$1,300 per pupil per year limit; provided further, that the department shall review all qualified proposals and award approved grants not later than August 15, 2007; provided further, that the department may expend up to \$250,000 on ELT planning grants as part of the department's School Redesign: Expanding Learning Time to Support Student Success grant; provided further, that to be qualifying, planning grant applications must contain, but need not be limited, to the process the district will use to create an expanded learning time implementation plan, the stated intent to convert one or more schools into an expanded learning time school that adds, on a mandatory basis for all students, no less than 300 more hours to the school schedule than is standard for the applying district; the rationale for expanding learning time including specific goals, and the anticipated number of schools and students that will participate in the expanded learning time initiative; provided further, that all school districts are eligible to apply for planning grants but not less than 60 per cent of said grants shall be awarded to qualifying districts where 25 per cent or more of students are eligible for free or reduced-price meals under the federally funded school meals program; provided further, that in awarding such grants, the department shall support the inclusion of districts not given such priority in order to demonstrate the efficacy and value of the program across a broad range of districts and schools relative to the socioeconomic status and achievement levels of students they educate; provided further, that the department shall review all qualified proposals and award planning grants not later than November 1, 2007; provided further, that upon being awarded said planning grants each district will create a detailed expanded learning time implementation plan; provided further, that teachers, parents, community members, and partner organizations participate in the development of said implementation plan; ***provided further, that in carrying out the provisions of this item,***

funds may be expended by the department to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of the program; provided further, that the department shall issue an annual report, not later than February 1, 2008 on the implementation of plans in all participating districts; provided further, that said report shall include, but not be limited to: the names of schools and school districts participating; the number of students attending these schools and the nature and type of changes made in participating schools as a result of this program; provided further, that the report shall also include an anticipated budget for this program for the next fiscal year and a breakdown of the distribution of the \$1,300 per student by school; provided further, that said report shall be provided to the secretary of administration and finance, the senate president, the speaker of the house, the chairs of the house and senate committees on ways and means and the house and senate chairs of the joint committee on education; provided further, that for the purpose of this item, appropriated funds may be expended through August 31st, 2008 to allow for planning and implementation during the summer months; provided further, that any grant funds distributed from this item to a city, town, or regional school district shall be deposited with the treasurer of such city, town, or regional school district and held in a separate account and shall be expended by the school committee of such city, town, or regional school district without further appropriation, notwithstanding any general or special law to the contrary; and provided further, that no funds shall be expended for personnel costs at the department of education..... \$13,000,000

6. Year One Report

The Department of Education has contracted with Abt Associates of Cambridge, Massachusetts, to conduct a comprehensive, multi-year evaluation of the ELT initiative. The evaluation is designed to elicit information on factors affecting implementation and, ultimately, on program impact. Student performance, as measured by MCAS, will be reviewed over several years to enable the evaluators to reliably draw conclusions about the effects of additional time in the participating schools. The full Year One report written by Abt Associates is attached below beginning with their Executive Summary.

Evaluation of the Expanded Learning Time Initiative: Year One Report, 2006-2007

Executive Summary

Ensuring that all students in the United States achieve academic proficiency is at the forefront of today's domestic policy agenda, and over the past decade there has been a heavy emphasis on standards and accountability as a way to achieve this goal. Responding to the call to action, many districts and schools are undertaking reform initiatives that challenge traditional images of public education. Providing additional instructional time—in the school day and year—is one reform initiative that holds promise to help achieve the desired goals. With additional time devoted to teaching and learning, schools may be able to attain the ultimate goal of universal proficiency.

The Massachusetts Expanded Learning Time Initiative

In 2005, the Massachusetts state legislature authorized funding for the Expanded Learning Time (ELT) Planning and Early Implementation Grant program as a way to further its longstanding commitment to improving student outcomes and reducing the achievement gap.

The ELT Planning and Early Implementation Grant program was created to “provide resources for districts to plan the innovative redesign of selected schools that will offer challenging, research-based, and varied learning experiences focused on raising student achievement.”¹ The paramount requirement was that redesigned schools must expand their days and/or year to include 30 percent more time than their previous schedules. Further, three specific objectives were set out for use of the additional time:

- provide more instructional opportunities in math, literacy, science, and other core subjects to support student achievement;
- integrate enrichment opportunities into student learning; and
- provide educators with increased opportunities to plan and to participate in professional development.²

Ten schools in five districts successfully planned for ELT and were ultimately awarded Implementation Grants to begin operating their expanded schedules in September 2006.³ The awards to individual schools ranged from \$195,000 to \$1,527,500, amounting to an additional \$1,300 per enrolled student, which represents an increase of between five and 12 percent of the districts' regular per pupil expenditures.

¹ Massachusetts Department of Education.

² FY2006 Planning and Early Implementation grant proposal, Massachusetts Department of Education.

³ The five districts were Boston, Cambridge, Fall River, Malden, and Worcester.

The Evaluation of Expanded Learning Time

The evaluation of ELT is a three-year study that is being conducted as two interrelated parts—a planning and implementation component that explores the early decision-making phases and subsequent execution of ELT programs in the funded districts and schools, and an outcomes component that examines the outcomes of ELT for districts, schools, teachers, and students. Ultimately, the implementation and outcomes components will be linked to determine if the approaches to implementation are related to the outcomes achieved.

The Year One report presents findings in two parts. The first part addresses the planning and early implementation phases for the first cohort of Expanded Learning Time (ELT) schools (Cohort 1) and is primarily descriptive. Planning and implementation data were collected using interviews and focus groups with school and district administrators, teachers, parents, and community partners, as well as teacher and student surveys developed and administered by Massachusetts 2020.

The second part of the report presents a look at early outcomes for the first cohort of ELT schools. The outcomes component of the evaluation utilizes a matched comparison design, in which extant data for ELT schools are examined relative to their matched comparison schools. Using a well-executed matched comparison design will allow us to suggest that differences observed between ELT schools and their matched comparison schools are attributable to the ELT program in individual schools. We found that the student and teacher populations in the ELT and matched comparison schools are comparable on specific characteristics of interest over time with only minor, non-statistically significant changes in the first year of ELT, which is important for the integrity of future student achievement analyses.

Major Findings

The 10 Cohort 1 schools started out with enthusiasm, learned some important lessons along the way, and made plans to tweak and refine their initial plans to continue their participation for the 2007-08 school year. Although survey results suggest that teachers and students had high expectations in the fall and somewhat less enthusiasm in the spring, overall our interview findings suggest that despite some criticisms and unanticipated logistical issues, the early implementation of ELT has been successful. Teachers, principals, parents, and community partners continue to be supportive of the idea of expanded learning time and embrace it in concept, even if there are some challenges to work out in its execution.

Our analysis of the implementation and early outcomes data rendered the following notable findings:

- By the end of the first year of ELT implementation, schools had made the most progress in adding instructional time in core academics, which is among the initiative's paramount objectives aimed at improving student achievement. All schools were also able to create new or enhance existing enrichment offerings with the expanded day. Overall, schools had the greatest difficulty incorporating time for teacher planning, collaboration, and professional development into the expanded day.
- Schools also made strides in fostering better connections and more meaningful relationships between students and staff—particularly through the introduction or expansion of enrichment activities.
- Though schools were given great flexibility in designing their expanded programs, the 10 ELT schools developed and adopted schedules that essentially fit into one of three categories: an *integrated schedule* in which the traditional school day was reconfigured to include lengthened academic blocks, a *divided schedule* in which the traditional school day remained intact but was augmented with a distinct expanded day program, and a *mixed schedule* that included elements of both the integrated and divided schedules.
- The distinction of schools by schedule type nearly mirrors schools' grade spans: the three elementary schools adopted integrated schedules while the four middle schools adopted divided schedules; two of the three K-8 schools adopted mixed schedules. It may be that a school's grade span dictates logistical or procedural decisions and/or reduces the flexibility of the school schedule.
- All 10 Cohort 1 schools reported that the level of funding limits their programs, especially with regard to staffing.
- Districts were required to obtain letters of support from teachers unions to plan for ELT. Districts that were interested in ELT but unable to garner union support could not proceed with planning and/or implementation. Districts and schools that involved the unions early in the process and maintained open communication tended to arrive at agreements that were more aligned with the schools' proposed staffing models than districts and schools that had less union involvement in planning for ELT.
- Near the end of the first year of ELT, almost two-thirds of teacher survey respondents reported that they perceived positive effects of the expanded schedule on several dimensions of classroom instruction. In addition, more than

half of teacher survey respondents indicated that student academic performance and engagement in school were improved as a result of ELT.

- Students' feelings about the expanded day varied significantly by grade level, with younger students reporting positive feelings about ELT with more frequency than older students. Specifically, nearly two-thirds of students in elementary grades were happy or very happy about a longer school day as compared to 35 percent or less of students in middle school grades.
- The teacher surveys asked respondents to list the advantages and disadvantages of the expanded day. The most frequently cited advantages were increased instructional time, enrichment opportunities, and student safety. The most common disadvantages were student fatigue, teacher and staff fatigue, and scheduling issues.
- We found no effect of ELT on indicators of student behavior, including rates of attendance, truancy, in-school suspension, and out-of-school suspension, as compared to non-ELT matched comparison schools.

One school administrator summed up the first year evaluation findings quite nicely, noting that this year “has been about working out the procedural kinks [i.e., logistics and operations]. Improving instructional quality is next.” With a short planning period, and eleventh hour notification that grants had been received, Cohort 1 schools are pioneering the initiative. Subsequent cohorts have had more opportunity to plan, and as each year of funding is approved by the legislature we hypothesize that schools will perceive a stronger likelihood that funding will come through and will be less hesitant to make commitments to major schedule changes and to community partners. Thus we might also expect to see faster or greater improvements in student outcomes in schools in later years. For the early implementation sites, we are not expecting dramatic early improvements in student outcomes given the complexities they experienced in implementation. As schools are better able to consistently provide teachers with adequate individual and collaborative planning time and professional development, and to offer student-centered enrichment opportunities, the added instructional time likely will be put to even more productive use.

Future Analyses

In the second year of the ELT evaluation, the study team will continue to track the implementation and outcomes for Cohort 1 and begin collecting data in the nine Cohort 2 schools implementing ELT in 2007-08. The following is a look ahead to future reports:

- Planning and implementation topics that may be examined in future reports include technical assistance to schools, the actual financial costs of implementing ELT versus the grant award, and the characteristics of districts or schools that do not proceed past the planning phase.

Subsequent evaluation reports will include analyses of student MCAS achievement data, which will center on a comparative interrupted time series (ITS) analysis of the impact of ELT on student achievement. A comparative ITS design is the most rigorous possible given the grant award process, and this type of design is strongest when there are at least five years of prior achievement data and at least two years of post-intervention achievement data available. Hence, we will conduct ITS analyses after Cohort 1 schools have completed their second year of ELT.